

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 PEKING 01406 01 OF 02 121252Z

51

ACTION SS-20

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 DRC-01 SSO-00 CCO-00 ISO-00 EA-11

NSCE-00 IO-14 NEA-10 A-01 NSC-10 SPC-03 CIAE-00

DODE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 USIA-15 PRS-01

USSS-00 /127 W

----- 098918

P 120930Z NOV 73

FM USLO PEKING

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1002

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 PEKING 1406

SECTO 141

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: OVIP (KISSINGER, HENRY A.)

SUBJECT: SECVISIT - PEKING

REF: SECTO 139

FOR EAGLEBURGER/VEST PASS SKOWCROFT FROM MCCLOSKEY

1. HERE IS TRANSCRIPT OF SECRETARY'S INTERVIEW TO BE
BROADCAST 6 P.M. EDT NOVEMBER 12.

2. QUOTE. KAPLOW: MR. SECRETARY, WHAT HAVE YOU BEEN
TALKING TO THE CHINESE ABOUT?

SECRETARY KISSINGER: EVER SINCE WE ESTABLISHED CONTACT
WITH THE CHINESE WE HAVE BEEN MEETING AT THIS LEVEL
TWICE A YEAR AND THERE IS GENERALLY AN EXCHANGE OF VIEWS
ABOUT THE WHOLE RANGE OF INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS AND
ALSO A DISCUSSION OF WHERE SINO-U.S. RELATIONS SHOULD
GO OVER THE NEXT PERIOD AND THAT HAS BEEN THE MAIN
SUBJECT OF OUR CONVERSATION.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 PEKING 01406 01 OF 02 121252Z

Q: CAN YOU BE MORE SPECIFIC ABOUT WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN

DISCUSSING?

A: IN GENERAL, YOU CAN ASSUME WE HAVE DISCUSSED ALL OUTSTANDING INTERNATIONAL ISSUES AS WELL AS SINO-U.S. RELATIONSHIPS.

Q: ON THE MIDDLE EAST, WHEN AND HOW WILL THE PEACE CONFERENCE PROCEED?

A: WE HAVE HAD FROM THE BEGINNING TWO OBJECTIVES: ONE IS TO STABILIZE THE CEASE FIRE AND THEN ONCE THE CEASE FIRES WAS STABILIZED, WE MOVE FROM THERE TO A PEACE CONFERENCE. AS YOU KNOW, ISRAEL AND EGYPT YESTERDAY SIGNED THE CEASE FIRE STABILIZATION ARRANGEMENT THAT WAS WORKED OUT LAST WEEK. THEY HAVE TO NEGOTIATE SOME OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MODALITIES OF THIS. WHEN THAT IS COMPLETED, WHICH WE HOPE WILL BE SOON, WE WILL MOVE INTO SETTING UP THE PEACE CONFERENCE. OUR EXPECTATION IS THAT THIS SHOULD NOT BE MORE THAN A MATTER OF WEEKS.

Q: MR. SECRETARY, ISN'T IT INHERENTLY DANGEROUS FOR THE SUPER POWERS, THE U.S. AND RUSSIA, TO BECOME COMMITTED TO GUARANTEEING PEACE ARRANGEMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

A: SO FAR, MARVIN, THERE HAS NOT BEEN ANY PRECISE DISCUSSION OF GUARANTEES. WHAT WE HAVE DONE UP TO NOW IS NOT GUARANTEE ANY PARTICULAR SETTLEMENT BUT TRY TO BE HELPFUL TO THE PARTIES IN NARROWING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM. THE ARAB NATIONS AND ISRAEL HAVE BEEN FIGHTING EACH OTHER FOR NEARLY A GENERATION AND MANY ISSUES ARE FRAUGHT WITH TREMENDOUS EMOTION WITH THEM. THEREFORE, IF WE CAN STRIP AWAY SOME OF THE EMOTION AND PRESENT IT IN A WAY THAT IS MORE ACCEPTABLE TO BOTH SIDES WE CAN MAKE SOME PROGRESS AS WAS MADE LAST WEEK. WE HAVE NOT YET GIVEN ANY PARTICULAR GUARANTEES. HOWEVER, I WOULD ASSUME THAT IF THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS SUCCEED THERE WILL BE A VERY SERIOUS PROBLEM ESPECIALLY FOR ISRAEL OF HOW ITS SECURITY CAN BE ASSURED UNDER CONDITIONS WHEN THE FINAL BORDERS WILL CERTAINLY BE DIFFERENT FROM THE CEASE FIRE LINES AND WHEN WITHDRAWALS

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 PEKING 01406 01 OF 02 121252Z

ARE INVOLVED AS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242 PROVIDES. AT THIS POINT THE QUESTIONS OF GUARANTEES WILL ARISE AND WE HAVE TO THEN ASK THE QUESTION WHAT SORT OF GUARANTEES -- UNILATERAL, SEVERAL COUNTRIES AND SO FORTH. SECOND, MOREOVER, THE GREAT POWERS ARE ALREADY INVOLVED TO SOME EXTENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST. WHAT WE HAVE TO DO IS TO TRY TO PREVENT EVERY CRISIS FROM TURNING INTO A CLASH OF THE SUPER POWERS. IN THAT RESPECT I AGREE WITH YOU.

Q: MR. SECRETARY, HOW MUCH PRESSURE IS THE UNITED STATES WILLING TO APPLY TO GET ISRAEL TO MAKE THE KIND OF CONCESSIONS THAT WILL BE NECESSARY FOR A FAIR SETTLEMENT?

A: FIRST YOU ARE ASSUMING SOMETHING THAT WILL STILL REMAIN TO BE REVEALED THROUGH THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION. ISRAEL HAS ALWAYS AGREED THAT THE FINAL BORDERS WILL NOT BE THE CEASE FIRE LINES EITHER OF 1967 OR OF 1973 AND WE HAVE EVERY HOPE THAT THROUGH THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SETTLEMENT WILL BE ACHIEVED. THE UNITED STATES STATED DURING THE CONFLICT AND HAS STATED SINCE THAT IT WOULD MAKE A MAJOR EFFORT TO BRING THE PARTIES TOGETHER. THAT WILL BE OUR INTENTION. WE DON'T EXPECT THAT IT WILL REQUIRE MAJOR PRESSURE ON EITHER OF THE SIDES.

Q: ARE YOU SATISFIED THAT THE MAJOR POWERS IN SPONSORING THIS PEACE CONFERENCE WILL NOT TRY TO USE IT IN THE FUTURE TO GAIN A MAJOR EDGE IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

A: THE TEMPTATION IS ALWAYS THERE TO EXPLOIT A SITUATION TO THE ADVANTAGE OF ONE OR THE OTHER OF THE SUPER POWERS, HOWEVER, IF THE SUPER POWERS UNDERSTAND THEIR OWN INTERESTS AND THE WORLD INTERESTS THEY OUGHT TO REALIZE THAT THE OTHER SIDE CAN ALWAYS MATCH THEM IN TERMS OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT. AND THAT THE ATTEMPT TO TURN THIS INTO A SUPER POWER CONFRONTATION MUST LEAD TO A CONSTANTLY INCREASING DANGER OF WAR. THE EFFORT MAY BE MADE. WHEN IT IS MADE WE WILL RESIST IT AS WE HAVE IN THE PAST. WE HOPE, AND THAT WILL CERTAINLY BE OUR ATTITUDE, THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL APPROACH THESE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SAME SPIRIT WE SHALL, NAMELY, THAT A SETTLEMENT JUST

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 PEKING 01406 01 OF 02 121252Z

TO ALL PARTIES IS IN THE INTEREST OF EVERYBODY. IF THEY DO NOT, THEN WE WILL HAVE TO SEE WHAT ELSE CAN BE DONE.

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 PEKING 01406 02 OF 02 121331Z

51

ACTION SS-20

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 DRC-01 SSO-00 CCO-00 ISO-00 EA-11

NSCE-00 IO-14 NEA-10 A-01 NSC-10 SPC-03 CIAE-00

DODE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 USIA-15 PRS-01

USSS-00 /127 W

----- 099245

P 120930Z NOV 73

FM USLO PEKING

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1003

UNCLAS SECTION 02 OF 02 PEKING 1406

SECTO 141

Q: MR. SECRETARY, THE SOVIET UNION HAS DIRECT BILATERAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH EGYPT, SYRIA, IRAQ AND A NUMBER OF OTHER ARAB COUNTRIES. SENATOR FULBRIGHT IN THE PAST HAS CALLED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BILATERAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL. WOULD THE ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT THAT?

A: IT HAS BEEN A CONSTANT AMERICAN POLICY SUPPORTED IN EVERY ADMINISTRATION AND CARRYING WIDE BIPARTISAN SUPPORT THAT THE EXISTENCE OF ISRAEL WILL BE SUPPORTED BY THE UNITED STATES. THIS HAS BEEN OUR POLICY IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY FORMAL ARRANGEMENT AND IT HAS NEVER BEEN CHALLENGED NO MATTER WHICH ADMINISTRATION WAS IN OFFICE. THE QUESTION THEN IS WHERE ARE THE BORDERS AND WHAT ARE THE SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS AND THIS IS WHAT IS GOING TO BE NEGOTIATED IN THE NEXT PHASE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242. WHETHER THE SECURITY GUARANTEES SHOULD BE EXPRESSED IN SOME FORMAL DOCUMENT OR IN SOME OTHER WAY I THINK WE SHOULD WAIT UNTIL THE NEGOTIATIONS ARE COMPLETED BUT IT IS ONE OF THE IDEAS THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 PEKING 01406 02 OF 02 121331Z

Q: IN THAT CONNECTION, MR. SECRETARY, GIVEN THE OIL SITUATION, THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND TERRITORY INVOLVED, THE NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION, WHY IS IT IN THE AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST TO SUPPORT ISRAEL SO STRONGLY? I ASK THAT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF GUARANTEEING THE EXISTENCE OF ISRAEL.

A: THE UNITED STATES IN THE ENTIRE POST WAR PERIOD HAS SUPPORTED THE CONCEPT THAT INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS SHOULD NOT BE SETTLED BY FORCE. IT HAS, MOREOVER, SUPPORTED THE CONCEPT THAT NATIONS SHOULD NOT BE ELIMINATED SIMPLY BY THE SUPERIOR NUMBERS OR IN ANY MANNER OF THEIR NEIGHBORS. THE UNITED STATES HAS SUPPORTED ISRAEL BECAUSE OF THE EMOTIONAL TIES THAT HAVE EXISTED BECAUSE OF THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITION OF ISRAEL AND BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT IT IS A GOING CONCERN IN THIS AREA AND BECAUSE, AS I HAVE SAID ABOUT OUR POSITION, TO THE DOMINATION OF ONE NATION BY FORCE TO OTHERS. THE OIL SITUATION WILL CONTINUE FOR THE INDEFINITE FUTURE AND WHILE WE ARE HIGHLY RESPECTFUL OF THE VIEWS OF THE ARAB WORLD IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR US TO BE SWAYED IN THE MAJOR ORIENTATION OF OUR POLICY BY THE MONOPOLY POSITION OR THE TEMPORARY MONOPOLY POSITION ENJOYED BY A FEW NATIONS.

Q: DO YOU GET NO INDICATION FROM KING FAISAL OR OTHERS IN YOUR RECENT JOURNEY THAT THE OIL RESTRICTIONS MIGHT BE CHANGED?

A: WE HAD VERY EXTENSIVE TALKS WITH KING FAISAL AND WITH HIS ADVISORS AND IT IS A PROBLEM THAT HAS MANY COMPLEXITIES BOTH FOR US AS WELL AS FOR KING FAISAL AND I THINK THAT BOTH SIDES ARE STUDYING ITS ADAPTION IN THE LIGHT OF DEVELOPING SITUATION.

Q: MR. SECRETARY, AS YOU GET INTO THE FORMAL NEGOTIATIONS NOW, IS IT SAFE TO ASSUME THAT ARMS DELIVERIES BY THE U.S. TO ISRAEL, THE SOVIET UNION TO THE ARABS WILL CONTINUE OR DO YOU HAVE SOME KIND OF ARRANGEMENT ALREADY WITH THE SOVIET UNION THAT WHEN YOU REACH A POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS BOTH OF THE SUPER POWERS WILL KNOCK DOWN THE FLOW OF ARMS?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 PEKING 01406 02 OF 02 121331Z

A: NO SUCH ARRANGEMENT EXISTS AS OF NOW. BUT THE UNITED STATES HAS ALWAYS HELD THE VIEW THAT IT WAS PREPARED TO DISCUSS LIMITATION OF THE FLOW OF ARMAMENTS INTO THE MIDDLE EAST IN ORDER TO AVOID THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE PILING UP OF ARMAMENTS ON BOTH SIDES. IF THERE IS A LIMITATION OF THE FLOW OF ARMAMENTS, IT HAS, HOWEVER, TO INCLUDE ALL THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH MIGHT TRANSFER

THEIR ARMS TO ONE OR MORE OF THE COMBATANTS AND NOT JUST THE PARTIES IN THE LAST WAR.

Q: MR. SECRETARY, THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE WHO ARGUE THAT DETENTE WAS EXPOSED AS A MYTH DURING THE MIDDLE EAST

CRISIS BECAUSE THE RUSSIANS THREATENED TO USE MILITARY FORCE EVEN THOUGH THEIR OWN VITAL INTERESTS WERE NOT AFFECTED. HOW DO YOU ANSWER THEM?

A: THERE HAS BEEN A MISUNDERSTANDING IN MANY RESPECTS ABOUT DETENTE. THERE HAS BEEN THE IDEA THAT DETENTE REFLECTS THE FACT THAT THE TWO SIDES AGREE WITH EACH OTHER AND THAT IT REFLECTS AN ERA OF GOOD FEELING OR SIMILAR DOMESTIC STRUCTURES. WE HAVE ALWAYS BELIEVED THAT DETENTE IS NECESSARY PRECISELY BECAUSE WE HAVE OPPOSING INTERESTS IN MANY PARTS OF THE WORLD AND TOTALLY DIFFERENT SOCIAL SYSTEMS. DETENTE IS NECESSARY BECAUSE OF THE DANGER POSED BY THE ACCUMULATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS ON BOTH SIDES. WE ARE IN FAVOR OF DETENTE BECAUSE WE WANT TO LIMIT THE RISKS OF MAJOR NUCLEAR CONFLICT. THAT GIVES US AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMMUNICATE AND TO MOVE RAPIDLY IF WE WANT TO. IT DOES NOT ELIMINATE THE CONFLICTING INTERESTS. IT DOES NOT PREVENT OCCASSIONAL CLASHES -- WHAT IT DOES MAKE POSSIBLE IS A MORE RAPID SETTLEMENT AND A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF RESTRAINT WHEN CRISES DEVELOP WHEN BOTH OF THESE THINGS OCCUR, BUT THERE ARE LIMITATIONS BEYOND WHICH IT CANNOT GO.

MR. SECRETARY, THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. UNQUOTE
KISSINGER

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973PEKING01406
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: PEKING
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731140/aaaabcww.tel
Line Count: 301
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: SECTO 139
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: collinp0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 24 JAN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <24-Jan-2002 by chappeld>; APPROVED <14 MAR 2002 by collinp0>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: SECVISIT - PEKING
TAGS: OVIP, (KISSINGER, HENRY A)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005